

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE**

NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CONTINENTAL AUTOMOTIVE  
SYSTEMS, INC. (successor to Continental  
Teves, Inc.); CONTITECH NORTH  
AMERICA, INC.; and CONTINENTAL  
TIRE THE AMERICAS, LLC (successor to  
Continental Tire North America, Inc.)

Defendants.

No. 3:19-cv-0396  
JUDGE ALETA A. TRAUGER  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE GRIFFIN

**ORAL ARGUMENT  
REQUESTED**

**CONTINENTAL AUTOMOTIVE SYSTEMS, INC.'S, CONTINENTAL  
TIRE THE AMERICAS, LLC'S, AND CONTITECH NORTH AMERICA,  
INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

In this lawsuit, Nissan North America seeks contractual indemnity from three different Continental entities for a California jury's verdict finding that Nissan was negligent and 100% responsible for fatal injuries sustained by three individuals in a 2012 automobile accident. But that attempt must fail because there is no contractual indemnity obligation between the parties regarding the underlying California proceedings. Also, Nissan has previously stipulated and agreed that it is barred from pursuing an implied indemnity claim arising out of the 2012 accident, and is not otherwise entitled to indemnification for its own negligence. Without a contractual indemnification provision, considering Nissan's stipulation and the Court's order that "any and all claims by and between the Parties for equitable comparative contribution, or partial or comparative indemnity, based on comparative negligence or comparative fault, shall be barred pursuant to

*California Code of Civil Procedure* § 877.6,” and that the California jury’s binding determination that Nissan was negligent, Nissan’s claims fail as a matter of law.

For these reasons, and as explained more fully in the accompanying Memorandum of Law in Support and shown by the accompanying Statement of Undisputed Facts, Defendants move this Court for summary judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 on Nissan’s claims for both express and implied contractual indemnity as there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and Defendants are entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed R. Civ. P. 56(a).

Defendants request oral argument on this matter via a contemporaneously filed motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert C. Donovan (*pro hac vice*)  
Andrew B. Fromm (*pro hac vice*)  
BROOKS WILKINS SHARKEY & TURCO PLLC  
401 S. Old Woodward Ave. Suite 400  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
[donovan@bwst.law-com](mailto:donovan@bwst.law-com)  
[fromm@bwst-law.com](mailto:fromm@bwst-law.com)

/s/ W. Scott Sims  
W. Scott Sims  
Sims Funk PLC  
3322 West End. Ave. #200  
Nashville, TN 37203  
(615) 454-9335  
[ssims@simsfunk.com](mailto:ssims@simsfunk.com)

*Attorneys for Defendants Continental  
Automotive Systems, Inc., ContiTech North  
America, Inc., and Continental Tire the  
Americas, LLC*

Dated: June 3, 2020

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and exact copy of the foregoing was served on the following individuals via the Court's CM/ECF system on June 3, 2020:

Eugene N. Bulso, Jr.  
Paul J. Krog  
Leader, Bulso & Nolan, PLC  
414 Union Street, Suite 1740  
Nashville, TN 37219  
[gbulso@leaderbulso.com](mailto:gbulso@leaderbulso.com)  
[pkrog@leaderbulso.com](mailto:pkrog@leaderbulso.com)

/s/ W. Scott Sims\_\_\_\_\_